

THE AMERICAN ✠ CHURCH ✠ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

February, 1920

Vol. 6 No. 6

Editorial Comment	-	-	-	-	507
Was Bishop Kinsman Right?	-	-	-	-	518
<i>Francis J. Hall</i>					
Men of Straw in Modern Fiction	-	-	-	-	530
<i>Frank Damrosch, Jr.</i>					
Mental Prayer	-	-	-	-	543
<i>J. H. C. Johnson</i>					
Religion Tomorrow	-	-	-	-	553
<i>Carroll Lund Bates</i>					
Pipe-Lines of Power	-	-	-	-	561
<i>Stanley M. Cleveland</i>					
The Technique of Religion	-	-	-	-	569
<i>M. Bowyer Stewart</i>					
Book Reviews	-	-	-	-	575

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under Act of March 3, 1879

Issued by the **TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO.**, 42 Albany Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
OFFICES: 42 ALBANY STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

MORRISON, REV. G. H., M.A.

"Mr. Morrison is a preacher born and made. He is thoroughly modern, knows how to choose his subjects, and how to evoke interest in them. He understands what to say and what to leave unsaid; what to press and what to touch lightly. He has a literary gift and a wide knowledge of literature; and through all he breathes an evangelical fervour."

—*British Weekly*.

THE WIND ON THE HEATH

"Evening addresses full of evangelical appeal. Young preachers would profit by study of their simplicity and illustrative skill. Would be a good book for Sunday reading in the home."—*The Continent*.

12mo. Net, \$1.50

THE WEAVING OF GLORY

"Any one of these thirty sermons comes like a breath from heaven. They are clear, strong, simple—Morrison's messages are among the best from present-day pulpits."—*Christian Union Quarterly*.

12mo. Net, \$1.50

THE AFTERGLOW OF GOD

In these Sunday evening addresses is bridged the gulf between ideality and the work-a-day world. They strike the high note of practical spirituality and the sweet reasonableness of Christianity.

12mo. Net, \$1.50

THE RETURN OF THE ANGELS

"Mr. Morrison's pulpit style is popular in the best sense—literary distinction; freshness of exposition, happy gift of illustration and a tender note of appeal mark his words."—*Scotsman*.

12mo. Net, \$1.50

THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE FLOCK

Scripture studies for every Sunday of the year by this preacher who knows so well how to reach the human heart.

12mo. Net, \$1.50

SUNRISE ADDRESSES FROM A CITY PULPIT

"These sermons are crisp, suggestive, beautiful. The points of view are invariably fresh—a breeze as from the mountain breathes through each."—*Christian World*.

12mo. Net, \$1.50

THE WINGS OF THE MORNING

"You sit down to read a specimen sermon and you want to read them all without delay—they leave the impression of a manly and sympathetic preacher."—*Methodist Recorder*.

12mo. Net, \$1.50

THE UNLIGHTED LUSTRE

Dr. Morrison's sermons appeal very directly to the modern mind because the inspiration is drawn from human life rather than from theology.

Net, \$1.50

FLOOD TIDE

Modern in touch and spirit, these great sermons should be of special value amid the spiritual difficulties of the reconstruction period.

12mo. Net, \$1.50

GEO. H. DORAN CO.

244 Madison Ave.

New York

Longmans, Green & Co.'s New Books

Recommended by the Bishop of London for reading in Lent, 1920

THE WAY OF PEACE: A Study of the Earliest Programme of Christian Life.

By the Rev. E. A. BURROUGHS, Canon of Peterborough, etc. With an introduction by the Bishop of London. Crown 8vo. \$1.25 net.

"'The Way of Peace' is the 'Way of Service' may be said to be the real message of this book, and never did we need it more. . . . This book points for a moral equivalent for War to the Service of the Great Leader, who is calling to-day not for 'fair-weather Christians' or merely 'orthodox Churchmen,' but for 'Adventurers for God!'"—*From the Bishop of London's Introduction.*

THE HIDDEN SANCTUARY: Devotional Studies.

By the Rev. JESSE BRETT, L.Th., Author of "The Altar and the Life," etc. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. \$1.75 net.

An effort has been made in this book to trace the progress of the soul in grace and love. If the supernatural character of developing spiritual life is consistently emphasized throughout, it is because of all that is taught in the writings of the Saints, and still more of what is seen in their lives.

GALILEAN DAYS. By F. W. DRAKE, Rector of Kirby Misperton. Crown 8vo. \$1.50 net.

A devotional study of some of the chief events of our Lord's ministry in Galilee, written by one who believes that no humanitarian view of Jesus can meet the demands of the Gospel story, any more than it can satisfy the deepest instincts of the human heart. [Nearly ready.]

THE TOWN PARSON: His Life and Work.

By the Rev. PETER GREEN, M.A., Canon of Manchester, etc. With a Preface by the Right Rev., the Lord Bishop of Winchester. Crown 8vo. \$2.25 net.

"I do most earnestly hope that in days when the lives of our younger clergy must be so hard beset by the alternative or combined dangers of hurried desultoriness, and of professional narrowness, this little book carrying so much within its covers, may go far and help much."—*The Bishop of Winchester.*

MUSINGS ON FAITH AND PRACTICE.

By the Right Rev. Bishop H. H. MONTGOMERY, D.D., Author of "Visions," "Life's Journey," etc. Fcap. 8vo. \$1.25 net.

THE CONDUCT OF PUBLIC WORSHIP: Notes for the Use of the Clergy, with Comments on the Language of the Book of Common Prayer.

By the Rev. F. H. J. NEWTON, Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans. With a Foreword by the Rev. Dr. GOUDGE, Principal of Ely Theological College. Crown 8vo. \$1.75 net.

THE REDEMPTION OF RELIGION.

By CHARLES GARDNER, Author of "Vision and Vesture: A Study of William Blake in Modern Thought," etc. 8vo. \$2.75 net.

"This valuable book. The heart of it is a careful, fearless, and reverend record of the Life of Jesus Christ in the light of modern criticism."—*Sunday Times.*

FROM THEOSOPHY TO CHRISTIAN FAITH. A Comparison of Theosophy with Christianity.

By E. R. McNEILE. With a Preface by the Right Rev. CHARLES GORE, D.D., Late Bishop of Oxford. Crown 8vo. \$1.50 net.

OUTSPOKEN ESSAYS.

By the Very Rev. WILLIAM RALPH INGE, C.V.O., D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. Crown 8vo. \$2.25 net.

"It is one of the few books of our time that will be read and studied fifty years hence. We believe that its influence will be profound, and profoundly Christian. For Dr. Inge has something of a prophet's insight, courage, power to arrest attention, and strong personality. . . . It is a work of rare excellence and importance."—*The Times* (London).

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers

Fourth Avenue and Thirtieth Street, New York

CONTRIBUTORS FOR FEBRUARY

The Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., is Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the General Theological Seminary, New York.

The Rev. Frank Damrosch, Jr., is Rector of Trinity Church, Bristol, Rhode Island.

The Rev. J. H. C. Johnson, S.S.J.E., is a member of the Order of St. John the Evangelist, Boston, Massachusetts.

The Rev. Carroll Lund Bates is Chairman of the Council on Church Pageantry and Drama, Rome, New York.

The Rev. Stanley M. Cleveland is Curate at Trinity Church, Princeton, New Jersey.

The Rev. M. Bowyer Stewart is Professor of Dogmatic and Moral Theology at Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wisconsin.

The Rev. Fleming James, Ph.D., is Rector of St. Paul's Church, Englewood, New Jersey.

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

42 Albany St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: GUY VAN AMRINGE, 55 Liberty Street, New York

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year

Twenty Cents a Copy

Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Foreign subscription, \$2.50 a Year

Volume VI

FEBRUARY, 1920

Number 6

Catholicity and the Congregationalists

CATHOLICITY has from the earliest days in the Church's history been guaranteed in two ways: orthodoxy of faith, and an apostolic ministry. Most of the early heretical bodies retained the apostolic ministry, but departed from the orthodox faith. Since the Reformation, the opposite tendency has been the rule. There has been a pretense at least on the part of many Protestant sects of remaining true to the old faith; but they have given up the episcopate or the priesthood, and thus have departed from the apostolic ministerial order. In more recent times they have

likewise departed farther and farther from the historic faith and practice of the Catholic Church.

Congregationalists, for example, tolerate very liberal views of Christology, bordering often on Unitarianism. They do not lay any stress on Baptism or the Lord's Supper. They would in most places hold that it made little difference whether one was baptized or not, and that one could be in good standing in the local church though not a communicant. They certainly do not believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, nor in the priestly power of absolution. They do not in their devotional system give a place of special honor to Mary, as is done by Catholics the world over; nor do they call upon the saints for their prayers. It is doubtful if any large number of them believe in praying for the dead.

It is now proposed, by means of the Concordat, to bestow upon such Congregational ministers as may desire it the order of priesthood, such as can only be conferred by Catholic Bishops. Then they are to be permitted to go on teaching and practicing in their congregations that form of religion to which they have been accustomed, from which have been subtracted so many elements of the faith and practice of the Catholic Church. In other words, only one of the ancient methods of ensuring their Catholicity is to be employed, namely an apostolic ministry. Evidently it is hoped that their acceptance of the whole Catholic faith will follow in due time. This is surely attaching a superstitious value to the grace of apostolic orders. We should call it false sacerdotalism. The possession of the episcopate and the priesthood did not bring the Gnostics, nor the Montanists, nor the Nestorians to the full acceptance of the orthodox faith. Why should it operate any differently with the Congregationalists?

So much for the effect upon the Congregationalists themselves. What will be its effect in the Episcopal Church? If we are not entirely misreading the signs of the times, it will introduce into many minds grave doubts as to our own Catholicity. Bishops of the Catholic Church have always exercised the most scrupulous care that those upon whom they conferred the sacred order of priesthood were not only sound in the faith, but would always so minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as their part of the Church had received the same. That has up to the present time, theoretically at least, been true of the Bishops of the Anglican Church. What will our people think when they see our Bishops conferring the order of Priesthood upon Congregational ministers, who must necessarily continue to teach their people the principles of the Protestant religion and warn them against Catholic practices, such as making their confessions or invoking the saints?

Enlisting Every Member of the Church

DR. PATTON insists that from the beginning he has urged that the Nation-Wide Campaign was not a money-making campaign, but that its primary object was, "to spiritualize the Church's energies, to co-ordinate all its agencies, to mobilize all its resources, and to enlist the last baptized member of the Church with all he is and all he has, in order that the will of God revealed in Jesus Christ may become the law of civilization."

Truly an ambitious program, and it is supposedly to be fulfilled in three months! It appears to us to be very much the same program that the Head of the Church has been trying to put through for about nineteen centuries. To

discover why the realization of His dream is so long in coming, we have only to look at one or two shining illustrations of "the last baptized member of the Church."

Here is Mr. E. Plymley Roberts, for example. He is of English birth, and has been living in this country for the last fifteen years. He has never been naturalized, as he prefers to remain a subject of the King, in the hope that he may some day come into a title. He likes his toddy every night before retiring, and he becomes almost apoplectic when he thinks of prohibition. He does not attend Church very regularly, as he cannot find anything sufficiently resembling his old parish church in England. He does not contribute to the support of the Church, for he does not consider himself as belonging to any particular parish, and expects any day to return home. Will Dr. Patton kindly tell us how we are to enlist this "member of the Church, with all he is and all he has," in the Nation-Wide Campaign in three months? The campaign may go to bally-hoo for all he cares. It would take at least thirty years' effort, assisted by several deaths, an earthquake, and a tidal-wave to convert him!

And here is Mrs. William Van Nostrand of South Bend, Indiana. She is a rich widow, who spends most of her winters in New York, when she is not sojourning for her health in southern California. She does not feel that she can give much to the Church in her home town, as she is obliged to pay such high rentals at the New York hotels. In any case she does not approve of the rector as he is too High Church; she prefers a simple service—in church: not at her table—that is quite a different matter! She rarely makes her communion as she fears infection from the common cup; besides her delicate health requires that she remain in bed until noon. She will not give to missions as she believes in

converting the heathen at home first. Will Dr. Patton further suggest a program of action for enlisting Mrs. Van Nostrand "with all she is and all she has," in a three weeks' campaign.

We hate to trouble a busy man like Dr. Patton with trivial details of this sort. He is concerned with big issues and nation-wide movements and large methods of efficiency. Still the parish clergy must think about details if they are to mobilize all the resources and enlist "the last baptized member of the Church with all he is and all he has." We fear that Dr. Patton has overlooked the fact that the Church is like a hospital. You cannot mobilize for active service all the inmates of a hospital. No more can you all the members of the Church.

Possibly Dr. Patton thinks that we should leave out the millionaires. We are informed that Mr. Franklin, when addressing the General Convention on the Nation-Wide Campaign, was greeted with enthusiastic applause when he said, "This is not a campaign for millionaires." As a certain wag told us, the applause no doubt would have been even more enthusiastic if the millionaires had been present.

Does God Will All Men to Be Healthy?

FROM what has been said by some of the modern advocates of spiritual healing, one would infer that our Lord's mission was primarily a mission of healing. It is assumed that all sick persons are under the dominion of the devil, and that in destroying the works of the devil our Lord must necessarily heal all who are ill. One of our clergy taking exception to an editorial in our December issue on "Sickness and the Will of God," has written us as follows:

"My unalterable conviction is that sickness is not from God, though permitted by Him. If our Lord healed all that were oppressed by the devil (Acts X. 38), whether that oppression were demoniacal or pathological, He was arrayed against sickness. As He came to do the will of His Father, He could not consistently bring gladness into the hearts of the poor diseased ones whom He healed, if the Father's will was that they should be sick."

The obvious answer to this is that our Lord healed certain sick folk because it was the Father's will that they should be healed. The same thing is true today, whether in the realm of medical and surgical healing or that of spiritual healing. God wills that some should be healed by these various means, but He also wills that some should be invalids for many years, and that others should die.

The Gospels do not warrant us in believing that our Lord healed sick people whenever He met them. At the pool of Bethesda, for instance, there "lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water." Out of this wretched multitude our Lord healed one. Those who believe that it is God's desire to cure all who are sick, would no doubt say that our Lord healed only this one man because he alone had sufficient faith. That however would be a gratuitous assumption, as the narrative tells us nothing of the sort.

The impression we get from the Gospel account of the cures wrought by our Lord is that He healed many sick folk here and there; but the greater number He left unhealed. The same conditions prevail today with reference to the healing ministry of the Church. Many are healed by prayer, confession, the laying on of hands, communion and unction. Many others are not healed, some because they lack faith, others apparently because it is not the will of God that they should be healed.

Which is more comforting to a devout Christian, crippled and bed-ridden for many long, weary years: to believe that the loving hand of God has touched him, or to believe that he has fallen into the hands of the devil?

We have grave fears that the healing missions of which we are hearing so much now-a-days, just because they promise certain relief to all who come with sufficient faith, will result in unsettling the faith of many who go away without any perceptible change in their physical condition. We have a suspicion also that such missions will not increase the prestige of the Church in the community.

The Popular Theory of Providence

FOR all practical purposes most Christians of the average sort believe in two Gods. One God is a merciful Providence from whom all good things do come. They ascribe to Him all pleasant occurrences in their lives, everything which turns out according to their fondest desires. If they enjoy uninterrupted health, if they prosper in their undertakings, if they live in harmony and peace with their neighbors, if their family affairs go smoothly, they attribute it all to this beneficent Providence. They like to think of Him in the words of the hymn, as "a pleasant river," from whom flow our "plenty, wealth, prosperity, and peace."

The other God is a hateful, vindictive tyrant, from whom issue all the discomforts of life: sickness, pain, suffering, failure, pestilence, earthquakes, cyclones, and wars. He is like the Demi-urge of the Gnostic heresies, to whom was ascribed the creation of the material world, which was regarded as a kingdom of darkness and evil.

The commonly accepted theory is that as long as we remain faithful to the good God, He will reward us by send-

ing to us everything that we want and shielding us from all that is uncomfortable or painful. He will preserve us from every form of ill health or accident, will secure for us success and happiness, and will permit nothing to befall us that will distress us in any way. On the other hand, if we are unfaithful to the good God, He will turn us over to the other God, who will take pleasure in inflicting upon us every kind of torture.

This is no doubt a very neat theory; the chief trouble with it is that it does not fit the facts of life. Wealth, prosperity, and success are not always the rewards of the righteous; nor do the righteous always escape from sickness and suffering. On the contrary, the wicked are frequently known to enjoy most of the good things of this world. They may possess the best of health, they may succeed in all their business ventures, they may surround themselves with comforts and luxuries and congenial friends. Covetous, selfish, ambitious, they do not allow themselves to be diverted by any subsidiary aims, and they usually attain the ends they have set before them. They are willing to sell their souls for money; and the arch-enemy of the race takes good care of his own, and rewards them by giving them the very things they are seeking.

The popular theory is based upon an altogether too narrow conception of Providence. God's dealings with His world cannot be ticketed and classified in quite so simple a fashion. We cannot say that God always sends the good things of this world to those who are faithful, and that the evils of life fall only upon the sinner. Providence is a much vaster phenomenon than that. Providence is a complex concatenation of all the forces of nature, all the tendencies of human history, and all the conflicting motives in our individual lives. If we wish to know what God is like, we

need only to look about us at all the marvels of the universe, — the outward manifestations of His power. We see God not only in the few things we choose to select, we see Him everywhere. We see Him not only in the peaceful valley, but in the mighty earthquake that rends the mountains; not only in the lovely summer afternoon, but in the hurricane and the tornado and the cyclone; not only in health, but also in sickness; not only in wealth, but also in poverty. The loving hand of our God is visible not only in success, but in failure; not only in a safe journey, but in a railroad collision, or a shipwreck; not only in the pleasant ways of peace, but in the disasters and horrors of war. Providence is by no means a simple force that can be conveniently fitted into our daily affairs and harnessed to suit our desires. Providence is vast and mighty, inscrutable and terrible, like all the mysterious powers of nature; like the boundless expanse of the ocean, or the strength of the everlasting hills; like the terrifying majesty of the storm, or those silent and strange and hidden forces that hold the stars in their ways.

The Alienation of Workingmen From the Church

IT would be interesting to know how many members of the American Federation of Labor attend church regularly. And of those who do attend, how many are Catholics and how many are Protestants?

In a striking article in *The Guardian* of November 27, 1919, by Canon Peter Green, on "The Church and Democracy," it is stated that the working classes in England are almost totally alienated from all forms of organized religion. We suspect that this is not far from describing the situation in this country as well.

Canon Green gives what he believes to be the cause of this alienation in a single sentence: "They regard the present industrial system, by which the few live in luxury, and the many are condemned to lives of exhausting toil, as definitely anti-Christian and unjust, and they regard the Church as the willing and conscious support of that system." This discontent, which was sufficiently serious before the war, has been intensified by the increase in the cost of living for the many and the profiteering of the few, which have been brought about directly by the war. Class-consciousness is more developed today than it ever was.

We are constantly being told that wages were never so high in America as they are to-day. That is true, but it is also true that the expense of living is mounting more rapidly than wages and salaries.

In our economic ignorance we are moved to propound a few questions.

Why is it that increase in the cost of production is never provided for by a decrease in profits, but always by an added price to the consumer?

Why is it that excess profits taxes are never paid out of the excess profits to the owners and the capitalists, but always out of the pockets of the long-suffering public?

Why is it that such huge fortunes, running up into the hundreds of millions, are still being amassed — and on a more widespread scale than ever before? We have no objection to higher salaries being paid to men of brains and organizing ability and inventive skill,—say as high as the salary of the President of the United States. But why should they mount into the millions?

And why should some perfectly useless and idle people have fabulous incomes?

The only answer is that our whole business and industrial system is controlled by the few; and operated primarily in their interest. One need not be a Socialist or a Bolshevik to see that this situation is all wrong. One need only be a Christian.

It may be true that the Church is "the willing and conscious support of that system," but we doubt it. If it is true, the Church may be justly accused of being utterly inane and foolish, for precious little of the wealth of the multi-millionaires ever finds its way into the Church's alms-basins. In the first place they rarely go to church. In the second place they give most of their superfluous funds, beyond what is needed for their servants and motor-cars and jewels and furs and steam-yachts and many residences, to colleges and hospitals, to charity organizations and war relief funds, to poor relations and pensioners, and to the United States Government. It is not considered fashionable now-a-days to give your money to the Church.

Why then should the Church ally herself with the rich, or bolster up the present industrial system? What does the Church get out of it?

Was Bishop Kinsman Right?

REV. FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D.

ON July 1, 1919, Bishop Kinsman sent a letter to our Presiding Bishop resigning his jurisdiction as Bishop of the Diocese of Delaware, being no longer able conscientiously to "hold any post of authority in the Protestant Episcopal Church." The general explanation given is that he has ceased to believe that this Church stands for the Catholic Faith and Order, and that its theory of Orders appears in his judgment to nullify them. The reasons for his change of view are summarized, and will be reckoned with, in this article. The House of Bishops at its recent session accepted his resignation; but, mistakenly I believe, refrained from deposing him, thus adding one more to the cases of lax discipline which are thought by Bishop Kinsman to prove that this Church has in effect forsaken her Catholic standpoint.

Now comes what appears to be credible information in the daily press that the Bishop was received in November into the Roman obedience, abjuring his previous allegiance and submitting to hypothetical Baptism. It is also said that he is to study for the Roman priesthood, with the prospect of being re-ordained in May. If so, his repudiation of his existing Orders will then reach its formal climax.

Dr. Kinsman has many warm friends among us, and their sympathies go out to him in the mental distress through which he has been passing. His sincerity and obedience to the dictates of his conscience no one who is acquainted with him can doubt. The case is really very pathetic. The fact remains, however, that Bishop Kinsman

has made a heavy accusation against the Church from which he received his Orders; and he has given reasons for his accusation, the validity of which we are bound to examine carefully and without fear or favor.

When we ask, "Was Bishop Kinsman right?" we mean right, in concluding, for the reasons which he specifies, that this Church has abandoned the Catholic Faith and Order and is no longer possessed of a valid Catholic ministry.

I. His Admissions.

These are comprehensive and fundamental, and are surprising as coming from one who on alleged Catholic grounds announces the renunciation of his ministry in this Church.

(a) He says, "It is unquestionable that the Anglican Communion is officially committed to the doctrines of the Scriptures and the Creeds. Authoritative declarations have always asserted this and do so now." In what discernible respect does this fall short of saying that one cannot be really loyal to the Anglican Communion without thereby being committed to maintenance of "the doctrines of the Scriptures and the Creeds," that is, of the Catholic faith? And is it to loyal or to disloyal members and ministers of the Church that we are to look when we seek for those who correctly represent its position?

(b) He also admits that the form of Ordination prescribed by this Church makes Holy Orders a sacrament. He says, "Hesitation about the use of the word 'Sacrament' as applied to Orders, as not one of those 'generally necessary,' cannot obscure the sacramental character of the formula, 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office of a Priest (or Bishop) in the Church of God.' " The sentence which follows, if it ended with the end of what I am to quote from it,

would express the only possible inference that can reasonably be made. He says, "In the best of company, I have taken this as representing the true teaching of the Anglican Communion about Orders." Of course it does, for it is the official language of the Church. And it is in line with the further official assertion in the Preface of the Ordinal concerning the traditional Catholic Orders of "Bishops, Priests and Deacons," that "to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be . . . admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination." The Form, he being witness, is sacramental; and the Orders designed to be continued thereby are the Catholic Orders, the Church itself officially witnessing to that effect. Nor is this all. In the Office of Institution of Ministers, the Presbyter instituted is officially declared to be "possessed of full power to perform every Act of sacerdotal Function." So that the Church not only ordains priests in a sacramental way, and treats them as members of the kind of threefold hierarchy previously preserved by the Catholic Church, but defines their functions as "sacerdotal" — a description which is religiously shunned by those who reject the Catholic doctrine of priesthood.

(c) He says, "The views of the Church's position which I have held, certainly the prevailing views of the House of Bishops, is simply that the Episcopal Church, strong in its 'appeal to antiquity,' stands firmly for the doctrine of the Incarnation as contained in the Scriptures and the Creeds, and, by emphasis on its sacramental character, perpetuates the life of the Catholic Church." In other words, the pre-

vailing mind of the House of Bishops, comprehending the "chief ministers" of this Church, interprets and accepts the Church's position and sacramental system in the Catholic sense.

(d) He says, "The stream of its [the Church's] life cannot rise higher than its source in corporate authority. Individual belief and practice may surmount this; but they will ultimately count for nothing so long as they find no expression in official action; nor can the Church be judged by the standard of individual members acting in independence of it." The Bishop is thinking here of the non-representative value of individual maintenance of *higher* positions than that officially set forth by the Church, and what he says is true. But it is not true unless it works both ways. One may not assert the non-representative value of individual views transcending the Church's official doctrine and consistently maintain the representative value of individual views which fall below and involve denial of such doctrine. Accordingly the Bishop is logically committed to the truth of a revised version of his language, to wit: "Individual belief and practice may fall below the Church's position; but they will ultimately count for nothing so long as they find no expression in official action; *nor can the Church be judged by the standard of individual members acting in independence of it.*" The bearing of this on the question before us is decidedly significant.

II. *His Contentions.*

In spite of the somewhat comprehensive admissions above cited, and in the same letter in which he makes them, Bishop Kinsman says, "Fuller experience which has come to me as Bishop and more thorough study of the history of our communion have forced me to abandon the interpreta-

tion of the Church's position which I held at the time of my consecration; and I can adopt no other which would warrant my continuance in office." He has "come to feel that the interpretation of the Anglican position which connects it chiefly with the Protestant Reformation is the one more consistent with its history viewed as a whole; and that its dominant tendencies are increasingly identified with those currents of thought and development which are making away from the definiteness of the ancient Faith toward Unitarian vagueness. . . . To preserve balance and proportion of the truth the Episcopal Churches have aimed at comprehension by compromise. I have come to believe that this habit of compromise involves increasing surrender of truth in spite of religious revivals aiming at stronger insistence on the ancient Faith."

He adds, "The chief causes of difficulty for me have been three: (1) tolerance of denials of the Faith seeming to indicate failure to defend the Church's doctrine; (2) tolerance of imperfect views of Sacraments seeming to result in failure rightly to use them; (3) a theory of Orders which seems to nullify them." He proceeds to elaborate each of these particulars.

It is not necessary to analyze his elaborations, for they do not go beyond the summary which I have quoted. In so far as they assert the presence of much laxity of discipline in this Church, and the unsuppressed ventilation by a certain section of our clergy of views which are inconsistent with the official formularies of the Church and with their ordination vows, they are true to the facts.

Yet one very misleading use of terms by him demands careful correction. Referring to "the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, of the sacramental charac-

ter of Confirmation and Penance," he says, "All these doctrines the Church tolerates." The word "tolerates" is quite misleading. No doctrine can rightly be described as tolerated when it is contained, either explicitly or by obvious implication, in the officially prescribed formularies and offices of the Church. And that these doctrines are thus set forth by this Church is susceptible of convincing demonstration. Tolerated doctrines consist exclusively of those that cannot be justified by appeal to the teaching of the Church. The Church's teaching is to be found in its official language; and to describe what is there set forth as tolerated is seriously to misrepresent the facts.

In view of Bishop Kinsman's admissions that our officially prescribed formula of Ordination is sacramental, and that "individual belief and practice ultimately count for nothing so long as they find no expression in official action; nor can the Church be judged by the standard of individual members acting in independence of it," in view of these concessions, the Bishop's inference from certain tolerated individual *bene esse* vagaries that the position of this Church excludes "the sacramental view" of Holy Orders is a glaring *non sequitur*. It is the more glaring in view of his acknowledgment that the sacramental view is the prevailing one in the House of Bishops.

III. *His Fallacy.*

The Bishop's general argument is that, as between the Church's official teaching imbedded in its formularies and prescribed forms and the unsuppressed prevalence in its midst of contrary private views and tendencies — views which he admits have not altered the prevailing loyalty of the House of Bishops to Catholic and sacramental doctrine—individual vagaries and tendencies must determine

the real nature of the Church's position. Such an argument is singularly fatuous, and as coming from one of Bishop Kinsman's intelligence and sincerity can be explained only on temperamental grounds. Whatever the explanation may be, the Bishop is hopelessly wrong. As between what is officially declared and what is tolerated only the former represents the position of a Church.

Its tenderness of discipline may be excessive; in which case reformation is needed. But until this laxity reaches the point of endangering the prescribed working system, wherein the Church's official teaching continues to be reiterated Sunday by Sunday in every congregation, it cannot with any show of sound reason be said to alter the position of the Church. The heterodox are apt to be most vocal, and to gain the public ear. Their utterances constitute "news," and the daily press publishes them rather than the sounder utterances of the vast majority of our pulpits. So the impression prevails among the unintelligent, and among those who by reason of temperament brood over such demonstrations, that the heterodox represent the general trend of the Church. But heretics come and go. Their movements rise and startle, and then decay, giving way to new vagaries as fleeting as ever.

In the meantime the Church's working system is loyally accepted by the general rank and file of churchmen, both clerical and lay; and when liberalism becomes especially rampant, a recoil inevitably follows by reason of the uninterrupted proclamation of the Church's real mind in prescribed Creeds, worship and sacramental ministrations. It is significant in this connection that whenever a revision of the *Prayer Book* occurs, the General Convention is constrained by pressure from many quarters to lay down the

postulate that no changes involving the Church's doctrine shall be made.

We repeat with justifiable confidence, therefore, that Bishop Kinsman is altogether mistaken in his main contentions; to wit, that the toleration of individual vagaries and tendencies proves that this Church's official teaching does not define his real position; and that its Orders are defective in Catholic intention and sacramental value.

IV. *The Laxity of Anglican Discipline.*

I have acknowledged that the Anglican Churches tolerate many vagaries and tendencies of an anti-Catholic nature. The facts require this acknowledgment. What is the explanation? I have rejected Bishop Kinsman's explanation, that it represents a non-Catholic position of these Churches.

It certainly does not so long as every heretical minister of these Churches is obliged when he uses the *Book of Common Prayer* to proclaim officially the doctrines which he personally attacks or rejects. If he rejects baptismal regeneration, he is required officially to declare concerning each subject of his baptizing that he "is regenerate." If he repudiates the real presence, he must none the less designate the consecrated sacrament when about to administer it as being "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." If he denies the "Eucharistic Sacrifice," he is still found habitually celebrating the Eucharist with the use of a Liturgy that is saturated with sacrificial language and action. If he repudiates the sacrament of Penance, he is required to pronounce absolution in exercise of the power explicitly conferred upon him when ordained priest, "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven," etc. At every turn his officially prescribed language will contradict his heretical vagaries. Furthermore

the great body of the faithful are guided in the main by this continual stream of official teaching; and whatever may be their individual failures to apprehend its full significance, they will rally to the Church's side whenever the issue between ecclesiastical doctrine and contrary tendencies come to a head. Moreover it always does come to a head when heretical movements reach their climax.

The true explanation must be looked for in another direction; and it is one that leaves the Catholic position of the Anglican Communion in full possession. We shall find it in the peculiar circumstances and the providential mission of Anglican Churches to win Protestants back to the Catholic Faith and Order. To understand this we must reckon with the circumstances of the Reformation period, and that with clearer insight than Bishop Kinsman appears to have exercised. We must also remember that the corporate mind of the Church—the mind which prevails amid the fluctuating counsels of its members and “leaders”—is not exclusively human, but is determined by the Spirit. It is found in what the Church actually does and teaches *in its corporate capacity*; and because of the Spirit's overruling influence this mind transcends, and often neutralizes, the conceptions and aims of those agents who seem at a given moment to determine ecclesiastical legislation.

The question before us is this: Granting for argument's sake that the Anglican reformers were Protestant in the anti-Catholic sense in their aims, did they succeed in converting the Catholic Church in England into a Protestant sect—in destroying the previously Catholic mind of the Anglican Church? The fact is that the human agents concerned had diverse ends in view. The resulting “settlement” did not fully correspond with the aim of any particular party, and proved to be very unsatisfactory to the anti-

Catholic or Puritan-Calvinistic party. Furthermore it is a patent fact of Anglican history that those who loyally conformed to the "settlement" developed as rapidly as it could master the full significance of the Anglican reformation into the Catholic party of Andrewes and Laud, of Thorndike and Pearson, of the Non-jurors and of the nineteenth-century Tractarians. The true significance of the Anglican system is of course that which grew articulate in the minds of those who really loved it, and who have again and again revived its full embodiment in doctrine, worship and practice.

But we must face the conditions and circumstances that have led many, including Bishop Kinsman, to a different conclusion. When the Anglican reformation took place, the majority of those in various countries who rejected the papal supremacy were driven by serious corruptions in the lives and practices of the prelates of that day to an indiscriminating reaction from the system which these prelates administered; and they often failed to distinguish between the necessary elements of Faith and Order and the corrupt accretions with which they had been overlaid. The English Church alone among the bodies of Christians who at that time abandoned the papal obedience succeeded in retaining the Catholic ministry and sacraments, the allegiance to Catholic antiquity as authoritative, and the Faith which the appeal to antiquity confirms.

But its revolt from papal jurisdiction, coupled with the reactionary impulses among many of its members above mentioned, served to isolate it from the Catholic world, and to strengthen the influence of Protestant agitation within its ranks. Its task of being faithful to the avowed principle of its leaders—of reverting to Catholic antiquity—was therefore greatly embarrassed. The hour was

one of great dangers, and these dangers were undertaken to be met by eirenic and subtle tactics, rather than by a sharply defined policy. Political circumstances accentuated this method, and royal influence was actively exercised to moderate controversy, and to prevent the exclusion of the Protestant party, without forsaking the principle of appeal to Catholic antiquity.

The policy of *Prayer Book* Conformity, as distinguished from definitive solution of the theological controversies of the hour, was adopted. The *Prayer Book* was carefully framed to embody the ancient working system of the Catholic Church, but with all possible avoidance of terms and ceremonial prescriptions that were likely to kindle strife and were not deemed essential to a retention of Catholic principles. To make conformity easier, the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion* were adopted as an eirenicon or peace-making platform. In these Articles Protestant feelings were sympathetically reckoned with, and as frequently as possible language was selected that would be pleasing to those who cherished them. But careful examination of the Articles, and of the use of language in that troublesome period, will confirm the contention that care was taken to avoid any propositions really contrary to the Catholic Faith and Order. These are indeed most emphatically reaffirmed; and where the Protestant flavor of an Article is pronounced, it will always be found on close analysis to stop short really of heretical assertion or negation. We are not proud of these Articles. An eirenicon almost invariably becomes obscure and difficult with the lapse of time. But the conclusive proof that they were not anti-Catholic is the historic fact that the anti-Catholic party was heartily dissatisfied with them, and made more than one effort to get them amended or to have substitutes adopted.

The Conformity policy soon met with disaster, partly because of the political association of the Bishops who sought to enforce it with an unpopular dynasty, and partly because it was not sufficiently Protestant. Nonconformity developed into schismatic dissent, which through immigration found a home in this country, side by side with other European Protestant bodies. But the Anglican Communion has not been permitted by the Spirit simply to acquiesce in this result, especially as it is rightly felt that the Anglican clergy of by-gone days were to a degree at fault in the tempers displayed during the reformation and post-reformation periods.

Accordingly our policy towards dissenters has grown sympathetic and tender, and we are indisposed to drive out those within who are defective in Catholic faith and practice, lest we end all hope of fulfilling the providential mission which has fallen to us — the mission of recovering Protestants to Catholic obedience. That this recovery is God's purpose, and that the Anglican Churches are most favorably situated for accomplishing it, is certain. But, of course, so long as we labor to this end there will be more or less of Protestant atmosphere within. To leaven Protestants we must breathe their atmosphere, and Protestant vagaries are frequently exploited in our midst. There is a sort of mutual penetration of propagandas, and alarming situations occasionally arise. The work is full of risk.

Yet the Spirit overrules, and our working system recovers our people to increasingly successful Catholic movements after each temporary setback. And this seems to prove that, with all the laxity and vagueness that is an inevitable by-product of adherence to our God-given mission, we are succeeding as well as can reasonably be expected. The general tendency of the Anglican Communion is up-

ward rather than downward, and each crisis leaves us more solidly planted upon Catholic foundations.

—O—

Bishop Kinsman exemplifies a temperament that is unequal to the strain of the war-front between Catholic and Protestant forces. He mistakes the confusion of the trenches with treason, and looks to the drill-camp as containing the only true part of God's Catholic army. Our sympathy goes out to him. But his interpretation of things is wrong. He has fled from battle.

Men of Straw in Modern Fiction

REV. FRANK DAMROSCH, JR.

IT has been said more than once that the pen is mightier than the sword. And among the wielders of pens the mightiest of the mighty is not the chronicler, the essayist, or the theologian, but the teller of tales. We may as well confess that we owe no small share of our historical knowledge, for example, to the books in which fact and fiction are interwoven at the pleasure of the author. From the Henty of one's boyhood to the Churchill or Erckmann-Chatrian of later years, historical novels have made real to us people, places, and ages otherwise half known or even unknown.

And of late there has come, as a sort of successor to the historical novel, the propagandist novel. Such books are in a class by themselves. They ought to have a label or a special cover design to distinguish them from mere fiction; I am not sure that it would not be advisable to have them a peculiar shape or to roughen their edges so that one might know them in the dark. Not that there is any objection to

them *per se*; it is merely that in fairness we should be warned of what we are up against. Mr. Archibald Marshall, in the preface to "The Graftons," replies somewhat vigorously to critics who have taken him to task for missing propaganda opportunities. Because, in the pictures of English country life before the war which are the background for his tales, he contents himself with a few sly digs at the mediævalisms still surviving, the fault finders rage at him for not making the "Clinton" series into socialist campaign handbooks; they think it inexcusable that he should not have produced a volume in which all his well-known and well-loved characters, after fighting or nursing a bit, return to Kencote and banish the old feudal life in favor of something very modern, perhaps even Russian. Mr. Marshall, however, gently disclaims any intention but that of writing a story. God bless him!

How utterly different is the author who, fired with zeal for a cause, proceeds to sit down and write a novel about it! His primary purpose is not to entertain but to convert us; and if he writes well, if he makes his characters convincing, above all if his propaganda is more or less agreeable to us in the first place, he will probably succeed. If you wish to further some cause or to propagate some philosophy and have even a moderate gift for story telling, by all means write a novel. You might write a much better essay or treatise than the fiction you would evolve, but you would be in danger of losing a valuable asset, your readers. Ask your book dealer whether more people read the Bryce report or "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse." You can not only attract your public by advertising a story full of "thrills and heart interest" but you can, if you are clever enough, tie your readers up to your hero and heroine so completely that they will swallow your sugar-coated propa-

only currently represents something or other, and that whatever it represents is nearly inferior to his state of mind and belief in the last chapter. Whereupon they will all be converted.

Such was Mr. William Churchill's method in "The Inside of the Cup." Many of us who delighted in "Richard Carvel" and "The Cruise" have despised this writer's recent adventures in propaganda. In this particular book he attempts a somewhat plea for liberal Christianity, whose more superficial adherents were to have been pleased with what he accomplished in their behalf; the more thoughtful men can scarcely have been satisfied with the curiously incomplete working out of the author's ideas. On its negative side "The Inside of the Cup" savagely attacked what Mr. Churchill supposed was orthodox Christianity, whereupon some of us arose in our wrath, not because we were being hit, but because we were being hit "below the belt."

John Hilder, the champion of Mr. Churchill's creation, is a wide, powerful, energetic. He explains, as the book progresses, an undogmatic religious philosophy, based largely upon the study of German Rationalism. But in order to converse as easily with Mr. Hilder, the author professes that his book should not have been more liberal but should rather have followed liberalism; perhaps it would be more correct to say that liberalism is thrust upon him, more to gently at that. He appears, therefore, in the early pages, in a most ill-fitting suit of orthodoxy. The only trouble is that this orthodoxy is perfectly unorthodox. However one may quarrel as to the meaning of orthodoxy, it is fairly obvious that to fall in any degree the definition of that should word implies a set of beliefs at least held by some considerable number of people. It would hardly be

an exaggeration to say that Mr. Hodder's orthodoxy is unlike anything under the sun.

We leave unquestioned the social and ethical propaganda of "The Inside of the Cup." We certainly do not object to an attack of the evils of our economic system and on hypocrisy in religion; we do not even complain when Mr. Churchill believes that the solution of these problems lies in a theological revolution, albeit some of us might disagree with his conclusions. Our complaint is directed against his straw-mannish creation of Mr. Hodder.

I shall not stop to quote from "The Inside of the Cup." There is a more recent book which illustrates the point as well and, for reasons which will appear, is easier to use in support of the allegations of this essay. Hodder is too vague to quote. We are not even told what he is supposed to be, although words such as "vestry," "canons," and "the Bishop" seem to point to the Episcopal Church. His "orthodoxy" is, in point of fact, a rather curious mixture of "high" Anglicanism with a modified Calvinism. His main difficulty is that he is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl. If he accepted the Catholic position of the teaching authority of the Church or the Protestant theory of the Bible and the Bible only, and if the author were sufficiently conversant with the position chosen, he might stand for something real in the world of religion. As it is, when in the course of five hundred and ten pages, to say nothing of the afterword, Mr. Churchill has knocked down Mr. Hodder's cherished beliefs, what is the net accomplishment? The destruction of Mr. Hodder's beliefs, just that and no more; for Mr. Hodder's beliefs are in a class by themselves and their downfall involves nothing additional.

Hodder has committed blunder after blunder in his feeble efforts to defend himself against the encroachments

of liberalism. For example, he stresses the Virgin Birth more than the Incarnation, making the latter dependent, apparently, upon the former; he insists on miracles as proofs rather than as manifestations; he supposes that literary and historical criticism of Holy Scripture is incompatible with orthodoxy. All these blunders have, of course, been made by flesh and blood clergymen; but the point is that it was unnecessary to make them in any genuine, up-to-date apologetic for the Christian religion. And an author writing a novel which attacks some set of beliefs owes it to his public and to himself to make the defence not weak-kneed beyond reason but as genuine and convincing as possible. If he needs the adventitious help of an unfair presentation of the other side he had better not write at all.

In a debate each side sets forth its own case and the losing team can place the blame either on the weakness of its proposition or on its inferior presentation, but hardly on the victorious debaters. The novelist, however, has the grand opportunity of arguing both *pro* and *con* and of being as fair or as unfair to the *sons* as he sees fit. And the less the unsuspecting public knows of the subject under discussion the easier it is to make straw men seem real. But you would suppose that any novelist with brains would see how the straw man method ultimately defeats the end for which it was evolved, how it weakens any position to the aid of which it is summoned. If Hodder had been made a genuine spokesman of orthodox Christians of some kind, Mr. Churchill might have, in the language of the day, "said something."

And Mr. Churchill has not been alone in his creation of an impossible clergyman. There has sprung up, of recent years a crop of novels dealing with religious issues in nine out of ten of which either the hero or the villain has been

a parson of the old school. If he was the villain, the hero has put him out; if the hero, he has been converted, e. g. Mr. Hodder. But in certainly eight of the aforesaid nine cases he has been, to those who know a little about the Christian religion, from first to last a man of straw.

The recent example, of which I spoke above, is Mr. John Galsworthy's "Saint's Progress." Edward Pierson, the "saint," is a priest of the Church of England, a widower with two daughters, his character not the militant type of sainthood but contemplative and mystic. The poor man suffers throughout the book. His elder daughter marries a free thinker, George Laird, and begins to free think on her own account; after which daughter and son-in-law unite in attacking Daddy. The younger daughter goes a bit further and adds an illegitimate war baby to her denial of the faith. The other characters are terribly modern; Pierson must not only meet these family troubles but every new acquaintance proves a thorn in the sensitive flesh of his religious convictions. It seems rather heartless of Mr. Galsworthy not to throw in one or two comforters; a nice old Anglican monk or some professor of theology with whom poor old Pierson could hob-nob a bit would have helped considerably; the somewhat stodgy brother Bob hardly fills the bill. Otherwise the author treats the "saint" with the utmost sympathy. Everybody in the book, although disagreeing with him, loves him dearly. If they only had let him alone, and not insisted on discussions, one would be content; one merely objects to accepting him as a champion of Christian orthodoxy. His sainthood shines undimmed from cover to cover, but in every argument he becomes puerile.

It may be maintained that there are saints whose intellectual powers are slight; whose lives are worth more than

The Technique of Religion

REV. M. BOWYER STEWART.

THEY keep telling us how ineffectual we are. They write long psychological novels to show how pathetic we are, and in the "movies" they have vigorous scenes in which the pillars of the Church make a lamentable showing in contrast with the modern equivalent for publicans and sinners. And the people applaud, for those are the things the people want to have said. Otherwise they would not be said—or not so much. There seems to be a widespread disgust for the whole régime of professed, and professional, organized religion. A few people write against it, but a great many people simply stay away from it, because they see no particularly good reason for the existence of it. The distinctly modern man almost takes it for granted that church religion is not worth while. But that is not supposed to be a condemnation of religion as such. The prophets who flourish now teach that many who keep away from organized religion have a real religious spirit: a spirit that does not call itself religious, or even know itself as religious, but that unconsciously, inarticulately, *is* religious; and in comparison with that spirit, the conventional practices of religion do not matter.

So there we have the great cleavage in modern America, between the religion that speaks to its God and the religion that doesn't. The Speakers have a professional clergy and an antique apparatus to carry on the speaking; the Non-Speakers have in the writers of books a much abler professional clergy and the book business a more effective apparatus to explain why they don't speak. There are not many

signs that these two religions understand each other, however affably they sometimes waive all disagreements.

Since Mr. Wells told people that everybody has to have a religion, even to get married on—and he clearly is not trying to make churchmen of us all—we have begun to understand more clearly, we think, what religion means on that side of its working. Religion in that larger sense is the general attitude of a person's life toward supreme reality, even if he never consciously thinks about it at all; it is the way he reacts to life as a whole. That attitude may be one of mild acquiescence ("he takes things as he finds them"), or welcome, or stoical resignation, or loyalty, or elated cooperation, or suspicious questioning, or serious shouldering of responsibility, or various other things. And whatever attitude one takes as a whole, toward life as a whole, that is one's religion. And in this meaning of it, every man must have a religion.

But to most of us who are aware of having a religion, it means also, or instead, a set of specialized activities, as prayers, sacraments, church worship, which we go through on specific occasions; these activities are definitely and consciously directed toward the Supreme Reality, and are meant to be the expression of the person's whole general attitude to that Supreme Reality, very much as friendly words and gifts are expressions of a general and diffused friendly feeling. So the whole meaning of our life, our whole response to life, instead of being left to the vaguest of instincts, is gathered up into a visible symbol when we go to church, kneel down, and offer all we are to the God who made us.

The two phases of religion, the diffused and the specialized, belong together. But sometimes they get divorced. One may find himself in a state in which his prayers are

not at all the expression of his real attitude to life: in his everyday general attitude he serves one god, while in church he serves some other god. Often a man gets into such a conflict of principles without knowing it, knowing only a vague dissatisfaction, an out-of-tune feeling, a sense that somehow his professed religion has not got hold of the reality which his whole life experiences. That is one way in which the serious young man comes to drop his religious practice in favor of a "larger religion," a great love for Nature, a great compassion for all humankind, a great ethical inspiration, a great longing for a new, fresh, and vivid God, in place of the old shrivelled God of the churches. Isn't that about the way they talk?

Is our specialized religion so very wrong, then? It is simply using what skill we may have to make articulate our innermost whole-attitude, to bring it up out of the well of the subconscious into the light, and to help others to a right whole attitude also. Communion with God in the Communion of Saints, as we say—we want this to be explicit on occasion, not perpetually hidden under the surface of consciousness. And accordingly we organize our religion as efficiently as we can. We have a professional priesthood, scientific salesmanship for getting people to take what they do not think they want, campaigns, drives, millions, duplex envelopes, questionnaires, and goings over the top; we have challenges, mountains of vision, inspirational dinners, "careful and prayerful considerations"; we have hangings, vestments, charcoal, wine and water, and all the rest, down to the missing match that has to be hunted for when it is time to light the candles. Skill! The organization of religion! Efficient or inefficient, whether it whirls on with the smooth purring hum of perfect adjustment or merely rattles like a lot of old tin cans, church machinery

will always to the sane man seem *paltry* in the long run. He may become reconciled to it as a necessary nuisance, but he will always feel its comparative pettiness: "it's not a man's job."

The reason for our mockery of religious mechanics is this. In most matters other than religion, the purpose of the machinery is not so very much higher than the machinery itself: but the purpose of the machinery of religion is infinite; and the thing is too incongruous. The Universe itself and one's whole attitude toward it is what religion has to do with—no less. Religion means living friendship with the *Universe*: if anyone has a religion that means less to him than the universe as he knows it, his religion is side-tracked. The name "God" may mean so much, or so little! If you believe in a god that is less than the universe, are you an idolater? The practices of religion are ways of getting in touch with the Center of the Universe. The key to your church door is a key to the Universe, otherwise your church, though it be a colossal affair, simply is insignificant. Eucharistic adoration is pointless unless we believe that in consecration the universe is all turned around, and the very heart of it becomes personally present: that the altar is then the center of the universe.

It does seem easy to forget all about the universe in the fussy details of church work and worship. A good many churches don't look a bit like the universe. A good many services don't seem a bit suggestive of the Infinite. The business and the frippery of religion seem rather cheap when you think of the Infinity of God. And God seems rather cheap when you get immersed in the mechanics of religion. It is quite possible to be so drugged by absorption in the sordid details of the church that God is really gradu-

ally and subtly cheapened in one's regard, until finally one has no real religion.

There you have the hideous thing that comes of forgetting, in religious practice, the Infinity of God. Those who have most to do with the technique of religion have most need of keeping up some kind of a study on the Doctrine of God, not for its technicalities but to keep the mind familiar with Infinity. It is of the clergyman's ethic never to dodge God, never to flinch from the thought of God, even the most soul-racking, never to say, "Oh, well, my work is going on all right: I'll leave these metaphysical subtleties alone." It is not a question of subtleties; it is a question of the all-encompassing majesty of the God of the universe.

This is not meant as a sort of "astronomical intimidation." The Infinity of God is not a matter of size after all. The Heart of the Universe has been personally revealed to us, in the little stable at Bethlehem. (Your church need not be a huge thing to symbolize that Infinity.) But the whole point of worshipping the Christ-child is that he who wields the forces of the universe is the one who also thinks and feels and wills as a baby. Anybody could be a baby: the point of Christmas is that in this Baby the Universe speaks for itself to us. Almost anybody could be fond of a baby: but somehow it seems that people who gazed at the stars, and saw how the heavens declare the glory of God, were the ones who worshipped this Baby. Sweetness, humility, love for man, need never make us forget that religion is concerned with God, the Infinite, the Reality underlying all reality that is.

Well, after all this, what shall we do with the church furniture, which so far seems to be all dumped out on the sidewalk? The machinery, the details, the ritual, the institutional, the seamy side of religion—this is necessary to sal-

vation, because we are human. (Fr. Paul Bull and Professor Hocking are in their several ways good on this point.) But it must be resolutely held to its purpose. The fixings and doings of our churches must be of the sort that will really speak of the Infinity of God, and not merely of his comfortable coziness.

Care should be taken to secure enough darkness in the church. If it is too garish with sunlight or electricity it is not true to the facts of God's universe, which has its shadows, of mystery, and of pain.

It is very important to have enough candles on the altar. Supernatural light is needed to guide people to the center of the universe in the Heart of God.

It is highly essential to have good music. This does not mean hiring professionals to sing for us, but it does mean singing music that shows at least decent respect for the Infinity of God; it too must have some darkness, and majesty, and mystery, and supernatural light and joy.

It is worth a great conflict to have pews in which people can kneel without feeling that all the woodwork of the place is irreconcilably hostile to any such posture. The church should be a place in which adoration fits naturally.

There should be a commission, composed of devout theologians and expert stage-managers, with fullest power to reform all existing and to design all future church buildings, on the principles of an effective technique of a true religion.

These parables might be spun out endlessly. But the end of the matter is surely obvious enough: we must not let our churches and our practice of religion belittle God any more than we can help, or tend to make people forget all about the Divine Holiness. There is the very word "God"

to be safeguarded: it must not become in our parishes a mere flat and flabby conventionalism, a hackneyed expression that connotes nothing vital, nothing real, nothing sublime. God, as we speak to Him, must not be made to seem less than nature as the scientist speaks of it, or less than human fellowship and love as the humanitarian feels them, or less—less real—than the solid, solid earth that the man on the street believes in as the foundation of all being.

Skill in the expression of religion must bear a steadily loyal relation to the spirit of religion. They will correct each other, if we are deeply concerned in their being concordant. We speak because we believe, but we also believe because we speak: the articulate and the inarticulate correct each other. In some such way our articulate worship corrects our life, and our life corrects our worship. We need to say our prayers, but our prayers need to be kept true to all there is of us and all we can know of God.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Primitive Tradition of the Eucharistic Body and Blood. By Lucius Waterman, D.D., Rector of St. Thomas's Church, Hanover, New Hampshire, being the Bishop Paddock Lectures delivered at the General Theological Seminary for the year 1918-1919. Longmans, Green & Co., New York and London, 1919.

Doctor Waterman's Paddock Lectures of the last year, published in book form during the past summer, provide the student of theology with difficult and valuable matter: difficult, because they present an exceedingly subtle and to most Anglicans novel teaching as to the Eucharistic Presence; because they are replete with references and quotations from the Patristic writers which must be read with great care in order to appreciate the argument; and also because the style, suggested by a truly humble spirit, is too cautious and conditional to grip the reader: and yet valuable, since they provide an interpretation of much of the language of

the Fathers in their Eucharistic teaching that seems, at least, to be a truer interpretation than are any of the current familiar theories of the Eucharistic Presence; valuable, also, because a careful reading necessitates refreshing the mind in the Patristic writings; and because, in order to reject Dr. Waterman's theory some clear, hard thinking will be required.

The primary difficulty is that Dr. Waterman elucidates his theory too gradually, interweaves his cautious constructive statements with a good deal of shrewd and penetrating criticism of current theory; with the effect, however, of rather bewildering the reader, who will perhaps read and reread a number of passages before he is sure of what Dr. Waterman is aiming to establish. If we understand him correctly, he rejects the current teaching of Rome as to the transubstantiation of the elements, not merely in dissenting from the metaphysical system on which it is based, but by rejecting wholly the teaching that it is the Lord's *natural* Body that is present in the sacrament; and as being entirely inconsistent with all those Patristic passages that continue to speak of the sacred elements as "bread" and "wine" after consecration. What is much more to the point with us, Dr. Waterman's criticisms of the theory of Transubstantiations tells quite as strongly against what he calls "the Oxford theory" of the natural Body and Blood of Christ being present in the Eucharist under the form of bread and wine, which, we suppose, is the generally accepted High Church teaching. With Virtualistic and Zwinglian theories he is obviously even less in sympathy. His interpretation of the Fathers is that they teach the identification of the bread and wine with the Body and Blood, without confusing them. Perhaps, his idea can best be expressed by a formula:—the bread and wine after consecration become the Eucharistic Body and Blood, or, the Eucharist is bread and wine plus Body and Blood, an embodiment of Christ's life for the purpose of imparting life to the faithful soul, but obviously not Christ's natural Body and Blood, which are in heaven. Certainly many of the passages quoted bear out this interpretation; though we are by no means certain that in most instances they may not also be used to support either the Roman or the Oxford theories.

The strength of the theory is its shrewd criticism of other theories, the weakness is any satisfactory definition of the Eucharistic Body and Blood, which he differentiates from Christ's natural Body and Blood, just as he differentiates the body of Christ in the Eucharist from the Body of Christ employed as a definition or description of the Church.

Dr. Waterman points out that there is no ecumenical definition of the

Eucharistic Presence, and we feel that his book is most suggestive in its often unconscious plea that there is more ground for agreement as to the fact of the Presence than for any theory of it. It is doubtless the truth that all theories are inadequate and at best approximate statements of the reality, and certainly theologians of every school (except the bare memorialists) are agreed that by whatever mode, whether by the actual transubstantiation of the elements, or by the elements as veils and channels, or by the elements even as mere signs of what the soul actually receives; and whether we conceive the gift as the natural Body and Blood of Christ, or as what Dr. Waterman calls the Eucharistic Body and Blood, or whether the words *Body* and *Blood* themselves be taken as mere symbols of the Life of Christ; all are agreed at least in this, that the Eucharist conveys to the faithful soul such Life of Christ, which He called His Body and Blood, as the soul can receive, as the pledge and means of union with Him. There, it seems to us, all Eucharistic theory, except that which destroys the words of the Gospel and runs counter to the entire Catholic tradition, ends. And there, in effect Dr. Waterman seems to us to leave it in his last chapter with his suggested eirenicon.

I wish Dr. Waterman would restate his theory in briefer compass and in a more logical manner, grouping his criticisms of current theory, and weaving together his arguments for his own theory, and boldly relegate his Patristic proof and comments thereon to an appendix. It would reverse the method he adopted for his lectures, but would do very much more, I fancy, to stimulate thought upon this really difficult subject. With the deepest appreciation of Dr. Waterman's learning and the devout and helpful use he would make of it, I confess his book, as at present constructed, is too difficult to accomplish the end he has in view.

LATTA GRISWOLD.

The Cross. By Donald Hankey. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.

We took up this little book of fifty pages with some misgivings, for we expected to find it but the flavorless warming-up of the reflections by which the "Student in Arms" so moved our hearts during the sad years of war. We discovered, however, a fresh and thrilling message which does not depend for its power on the circumstances of the moment. We marked paragraph after paragraph for quotation that we might give our readers a taste of the treat in store for them. But the passages marked are too numerous and choice too difficult. Get the book and read it for yourself—you will not regret it.

C. C. E.

The Rival Philosophies of Jesus and of Paul. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London.

The author tells us, in italics, that he "desires to establish that Jesus was not the founder of Christianity; that the Christ-myth had no existence until many years after his death; that his teachings and the teachings of doctrinal Christianity are mutually exclusive and opposed to one another. He proposes "to do this without going outside the New Testament for evidence," and adds, "the facts which are disclosed in these pages were unknown to me when I commenced writing, and have been as surprising to myself as they gradually came to light as they probably will be to many others." His competency for his self-imposed task may be estimated by the paragraph on page 50 where he says, "The parables of the sower, of the mustard seed, and of the leaven are all intended to illustrate the spread of the truth once it has taken root. The actual words are 'logon tys [*sic*] basileias'; literally 'the laws of the reign,' but have been translated by the meaningless phrase 'the word of the kingdom.'" His acquaintance with Greek is further displayed and his power as an exegete manifested on page 82, where he argues that Paul "must have been fairly advanced in age when he became a convert himself (1 Cor. xv. 8), for he says himself that he was 'born out of due time'—i. e. late in age." He informs us that all that is characteristic of humanity, apart from doctrine, had been known and practiced by the Essenes long before the time of Jesus or Paul, and that it was in "the synagogues of the Essenes that Paul argued, showing from the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ." We observe that two "Reverend" gentlemen, presumably ministers of some Christian body, contribute laudatory forewords. We marvel that a reputable publishing house is willing to put its imprint on so unscholarly a book.

C. C. E.

Home Nurture for the Little Ones of the Church. Kate H. Belcher. Morehouse Pub. Co., Milwaukee, 1919.

This book marks an epoch in the religious education of children. It is the fruit of the realization that the home is the greatest educational agency in religion. "The nurture of faith is the beginning of all true education and Mrs. Belcher has based her method on the fact that faith first exists in the relation between mother and child."

A series of attainable ideals within the child's vision are embodied in the form of a story or picture talk. Each lesson is preceded by a thought for the mother, presenting a definite aim to be impressed. A suitable set of pictures to be pasted by the child in the blank pages throughout the book shows a keen appreciation of the constructive element of education.

Mrs. Belcher states that no formal outline can take the place of a mother's natural expression and so her plan is simple and direct. The story of Samuel, who heard God speak because he was an obedient child, impresses the first lesson of life, obedience. The value of obedience during the early years is emphasized in the fact that "Home Nurture" devotes three chapters to this theme.

Mrs. Belcher has caught the true spirit of nurture in her dealing with reverence as the essential element of worship—"your very attitude as you kneel by the side of your child with bowed head and folded hands, while he says his evening and morning prayers, will breathe into his soul the sense of a Divine Presence around him."

To present ideals beyond the child tends to stunt growth and "Home Nurture" deals with only elementary virtues and faults.

Through a portrayal of God's care for His children and His love for them, "Home Nurture" tends to strengthen the child's trust in God and establish a personal relationship. Acts of praise and thanksgiving are provided that the child may experience a premonition of the joy of worship.

Mrs. Belcher's skilful treatment of symbolic education reaches a climax in the parable of the Vine and the Branches. The little child lays his heart close to the heart of nature, and what premonitions of the Divine Nurture may not be given in the wide treatment of this subject! The first lesson of "Home Nurture" was obedience and the last lesson aims to teach the child control through self-denial.

The closing chapters of the book are devoted to lessons applicable to the Church year, to be used at the discretion of the mother.

"Home Nurture" is a safe and sane book, based upon practical psychological principles. It may be used by even inexperienced teachers in the Sunday School, for the affective (emotional) element is wisely handled. "Home Nurture for the Little Ones of the Church" is the expression of a loving heart guided by a wise mind. It has sprung from the wisdom of heart insight.

MILDRED MERRILL.

Our Life for the Life of Others. By E. Z. Smith. With a Foreword by the Rev. H. F. B. Mackay. Longmans, Green & Co., 1919.

This little book is arranged in forty daily portions, with a view of its being used during Lent. At the head of each portion is indicated a passage of Scripture, upon which the consideration is based. The author has attempted to set the imagination to work on the highest themes, and the thoughts are singularly unconventional and stimulating. We know of no better book for those who find the practice of daily meditation difficult, and yet would like to make a beginning during Lent. There are about two pages of reading matter for each day.

Building on Rock. Character-Building Under the Master Builder. By Henry Kingman. Association Press, New York, 1919.

This is one of the "Everyday Life Series" of the Y. M. C. A. It proposes to deal with reality in religion; "we turn reverently to that unchallenged authority in the field of character, to learn what He would have us do and be." That is to say, the author considers that it is sufficient to contemplate the human character of our Lord for the guidance of those desirous of molding their characters aright. Apparently he brushes aside a rather wide challenging of our Lord; regards character-forming all that is needful, rather than any attention to the soul; and by a considerably interspersed criticism of and rejection of the Church and doctrine, relies upon an innate goodness of the wills of men to seize upon the picture of our Lord's nobility; and with that, build up for themselves all that can be required.

This represents, of course, the grave objection to Y. M. C. A. war- and post-war teaching. It exalts individual self-sufficiency; deludes men into thinking that copying the social virtues of the Christ-life is the essence of Christianity; leaves out of account entirely exterior help from the Church and sacraments, and any vital relation to God, for the cultivation of holiness.

Mr. Kingman means well, without doubt; but his bias against Catholic religion, his frequently false conclusions, his several inaccuracies about facts,—these rob the book of value for us, and make it dangerous for others. It is true charity to recognize that a part of the truth, reached from false premises, is an extremely dangerous proposition to lay before

people who may be susceptible of teaching, but who are not in a position to know what teaching authority they may trust, as having the power and right to instruct them.

P. R. F.

The Protestant. By Burriss A. Jenkins. Chicago, The Century Press, 1918.

This book is not, as its title would lead one to suppose, an attempt to estimate the intellectual and spiritual standards of modern Protestantism. It is rather an attack on modern Protestantism. The author calls it "a scrap-book for insurgents," and dedicates it "to the bravest men I know, the heretics." Dr. Jenkins is an extreme radical in his religious views, and he is impatient with the present representatives of religion, for their lack of unity, their ineptitude, and their bondage to tradition. He longs for the coming of a sort of super-Protestant, another Luther, who will smash the present Christian forces in the world and lead us to a better spiritual order. His style is racy and slangy, a sort of Y. M. C. A. jargon, and would be extremely irritating to any reader of highly developed literary tastes. In the second half of the book, however, the author seems to tire of this artificial *patois* and expresses his ideas in clear and forcible English.

It would be excellent spiritual discipline and a training in tolerance for members of the Episcopal Church, especially the clergy, to read the book. Its point of view is miles removed from our own, and for that reason it is often extremely suggestive and illuminating. We liked especially the chapters on "Conservative and Liberal," "The Three Sexes," "Parsons, Play and Politics," "The Irreligious Press," and "Bibliolatry."

The following quotations will give some idea of the style of the book,—and also an idea of how others see us:

"The Episcopalians began as Protestants. They heroically shook off the attempts of an Italian church to subjugate their free soil and souls; now where are they? They're the society folks. When a Baptist gets too rich for his old environment, he builds a stone house with an iron fence around it, and two iron dogs in the front yard, and joins the Episcopal Church. O, there are some poor folks in the Episcopal Church, to be sure; but their ancestors were F. F. V.'s or born in England a generation or so ago" (p. 60).

"The Episcopalian desires above all else to be proper. No one of them would read a dozen pages past the preface of this book—it

isn't proper. So I can say what I please, knowing they will never, any of them, see it. Their rectors are all fine chaps—in a drawing room or on a golf course. They are fairly well read, especially on subjects folks are likely to discuss in society. They can't preach, as a rule; because preaching is not emphasized among them; intoning the service is more important" (p. 61).

Mysticism True and False. By Dom S. Louismet, O.S.B. P. J. Kennedy & Sons, New York.

There is a vast amount of trash published on Mysticism. As a result the general public understands the term to mean anything that has in it an element of mystery, or some miraculous spiritual experience. It is refreshing to find the subject treated in so sane and simple a fashion as in the little books by Dom Louismet, with which many Anglicans are already familiar, "The Mystical Knowledge of God" and "The Mystical Life." Those who have read these books will not be disappointed in the author's latest work, "Mysticism True and False."

The mystical life, according to this writer, is nothing miraculous, but simply the normal spiritual life of the devout Christian. It is nothing but the intercourse of a living soul with the loving God, in the secret of the heart. There are three essentials for living the mystical life: one must be in a state of grace and therefore be free from mortal sin; one must love God fervently, and therefore not allow oneself to become tepid or luke-warm; and one must hold coscientiously to the orthodox faith.

Outside of the Church, according to the author, there can be no true mysticism. By the Church he means all those who in life were real Catholics at heart, whether they know it or not, whether other men know it or only God. "They will be found to have been saved by no other agency than the grace of God through faith in Jesus Christ and incorporation, public or secret, in His mystical Body the Church." Therefore he concludes that many who are not known to men as children of the household of the faith are nevertheless really so in the eyes of God; they are really in the Church and not out of it. Surely no Protestant of any kind can take exception to this teaching.

He likewise treats of false mysticism within the Church in two very convincing chapters on Jansenism or Rigorism and Quietism or Laxism.

We shall look forward with keen anticipation to the author's next work on "Divine Contemplation."

In the Service of The King

Suggestions for Unifying the Parish System of Teaching and Training the Young Life of the Church. By FRANCES H. WITHERS, Secretary Junior Department of the Woman's Auxiliary. With Foreword by the Rev. LESTER BRADNER, Ph.D., Director of the Department of the Parochial Education, G. B. R. E. Cloth, 75 cts.

A committee of General Convention, headed by Bishop Lloyd, will report that the "Church Service League Plan" "for the development of the life of the young people of the Church" is the solution of our need in dealing with these. Miss Withers' book explains that plan. The fourteen graphic charts contained in it illuminate the much discussed "Junior Plan" and "Block" system. It is a word to the wise, full of suggestions, combining ideals and practice. It represents the new idea of united service to which the Church is turning so rapidly.

CONTENTS: The Aim of a School of Christian Nurture—Competition in the Parish—A Parochial Board of Education—Parish Cooperation—The Five Fields of Service—The Block System—The School in Action—The Mission Fields—Missionary Study—Funds: "Whence and Whither?"—The School and the Parish Apportionment—Relation of Pupils to Central Board—Home Cooperation—Some Suggested Standards for a School of Christian Nurture—A Survey of the School Situation.

All workers in Junior Auxiliary and Church Schools will require this book.

Reunion

By S. L. OLLARD, Hon. Canon of Worcester, Author of *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*. In the series of Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice. Price \$1.15.

Canon Ollard covers the ground historically, treating of the various movements looking toward Reunion that have been attempted since separation began. His chapters are, respectively: Reunion with the Roman Catholic Church, Reunion with the Eastern Church, Reunion with the Foreign Reformed, Home Reunion.

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING COMPANY

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Avenue., Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

"I very cheerfully enclose \$2.00 for the renewal of my subscription. I was one of the first subscribers and I have enjoyed the AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY every month since."

(Signed) CAPTAIN D. R. FAY, Dallas, Texas.

The American Church Monthly

Fourth Year

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY. A magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States. Subscription, \$2.00 a year. 20c. a copy. SELDEN PEABODY DELANY, D.D., Editor.

From the Bishop of Pennsylvania: "I am very glad to express my approval of the American Church Monthly and my conviction that it will occupy an important place in our church life."

The American Church Monthly is reaching a large and growing audience of readers, worthy of the traditions of our Communion, and drawing to its staff of contributors a continuous exhibit of latent scholarship which has long waited an outlet for its encouragement.

RENEWALS NOW DUE.

Bills will go out at once to all whose subscriptions are expiring.

PLEASE REMIT PROMPTLY.

A Choice Book of Daily Readings for Lent

THE LIVING SACRIFICE — *Readings for the Forty Days of Lent*
Based on the Prayer of Consecration.

By the Rev. ALANSON Q. BAILEY, B.D. With an introduction by
the Rt. Rev. CHARLES E. WOODCOCK, D.D., Bishop of Kentucky.
Cloth. 12mo. Price, \$1.00.

From Bishop Woodcock

"Whoever is so fortunate as to read the helpful and inspiring meditations set forth in this book will have reason to be grateful to the author for the spiritual uplift which will be experienced. His reward will be to gain a clearer insight regarding the Holy Eucharist as the central act of worship and a deepened impulse to make more careful self-examination that he come not to this Holy Feast 'trusting in (his) own righteousness.'"

"This book is good to read at all times and will surely make for a better lived Lent on the part of all who are serious enough, in the spiritual life, to seek and accept assistance. In the desire for such assistance this aid to definite Christianity will not prove disappointing." — Charles Edward Woodcock, Bishop of Kentucky.

A BOOK OF OFFICES FOR PRIEST AND PEOPLE.

Compiled by two Presbyters of the Church. Cloth, red edge. Price, \$1.25. Leather, \$2.25. Tenth Edition.

A most useful and practical "Vade Mecum" for the Priest, this little volume contains the Occasional Offices of the Prayer Book, together with the Prayer Book Collects and many prayers for Special Occasions. It will prove useful to the Parish Priest, the Layworker, and the head of the family who leads his family worship.

Second Thousand.

OFFICES FOR SPECIAL OCCASIONS.

By the same Compilers. Contains General Offices, Parochial Offices, and Occasional Offices of Benediction and Setting Apart. These Offices are not to be found in any other book. Revised and enlarged edition. Cloth, red edge, \$1.25. Leather, \$2.25.

This new edition of a book which has already proved its value has received the imprimatur of a committee of The American Ecclesiological Society, and is published with its approval. The official services of the various church organizations, services for the laying of a cornerstone, the dedication of the churches.

THE HARMONY of the COLLECTS, EPISTLES and GOSPELS.

By MELVILLE SCOTT, D.D.

A devotional exposition of the continuous teaching of the Church throughout the year. Price, \$1.20.

EDWIN S. GORHAM, *Publisher*

11 WEST 45th ST.

NEW YORK